



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,044	07/14/2005	Ralph Biemans	B45313	7576
23347	7590	03/30/2010		
GLAXOSMITHKLINE CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B482 FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			EXAMINER GRASER, JENNIFER E	
			ART UNIT 1645	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/30/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM
LAURA.M.MCCULLEN@GSK.COM
ELAINE.X.MARTENS@GSK.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/523,044	Applicant(s) BIEMANS ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer E. Graser	Art Unit 1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 14-20, 53, 59 and 60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 19, 20 and 53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 59 and 60 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/9/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Acknowledgment and entry of the Response submitted on 12/9/09 is made.

Claims 1-8, 14, 16-18, 59 and 60 are currently under examination.

Claims 15, 19, 20 and 53 were previously withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-8, 14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite due to the phrase “genetically engineered to permanently downregulate the expression of functional gene product from the lgtb gene” because it is unclear what structures are encompassed by this language. The specification recites in numerous passages that ‘downregulation’ is preferably ‘deletion’ yet it is unclear what else is encompassed if it is not ‘deletion’. The structure of a downregulation versus a deletion cannot be readily ascertained. Further, is the term ‘permanently downregulated’ attempting to refer solely to ‘deletion’? Accordingly, the structure recited in the claim cannot be understood. The claims are vague and indefinite as they stand. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is requested.

Response to Applicant's arguments:

Applicants argue that the specification teaches various methods of downregulating expression of a gene and cites specific pages and line numbers of the instant specification for support. They argue that in light of the disclosure and teachings of the prior art, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to understand the scope of the claim. This has been fully and carefully considered but is not deemed persuasive. The instant claims are drawn to a product. The structure of this product claimed for patent protection cannot be readily understood. The metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter are unclear. While the specification can be used to provide definitive support, the claims are not read in a vacuum. Rather, the claim must be definite and complete in and of itself. Limitations from the specification will not be read into the claims. The claims as they stand are incomplete and fail to provide adequate structural properties to allow for one to identify what is being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-Enablement

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-8, 14, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 is vague and indefinite due to the phrase “genetically engineered to permanently downregulate the expression of functional gene product from the *lgtB* gene”. The specification states that “techniques for downregulating these genes are discussed in WO 01/09350) (incorporated by reference herein) “ on page 5, first full paragraph. Essential material" may be incorporated by reference, but only by way of an incorporation by reference to a U.S. patent or U.S. patent application publication, which patent or patent application publication does not itself incorporate such essential material by reference. "Essential material" is material that is necessary to:

(1) Provide a written description of the claimed invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out the invention as required by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112;

(2) Describe the claimed invention in terms that particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention as required by the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112; or

(3) Describe the structure, material, or acts that correspond to a claimed means or step for performing a specified function as required by the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

The instant specification fails to teach how to downregulate any of the genes recited in the instant claims. The specification is only enabled for an “isolated NNeisserial bleb preparation with a ‘deleted’ *lgtB* gene and not one with a bleb which has been “genetically engineered to permanently downregulate the expression of functional gene product from the *lgtB* gene”.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CAFC) 42 USPQ2d 1001 clearly states: “Patent

protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague

intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. See *Brenner v. Manson*,

383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) (stating, in context of the utility

requirement, that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but

compensation for its successful conclusion.") Tossing out the mere germ of an idea

Art Unit: 1645

does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-Written Description

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-8, 14, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In 1999, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") published training materials regarding the examination of patent applications under the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. (See http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/written_desc.pdf). Since that time, the case law and technology have developed in such a way as to necessitate a revision of the 1999 training materials. Consequently, this 2008 revision was created to supersede and replace the 1999 training materials. To the extent that any conflict exists between the 1999 training materials and the present materials, the present materials control. The

Art Unit: 1645

claims have been evaluated with regard to written description based on the Written Description Guidelines and Training Materials published in 2008.

The written description problem exists for each of the blebs with have been "genetically engineered to permanently downregulate the expression" of specified genes. The specification fails to teach these structures, the possible changes which are acceptable, which will create a bleb possessing the recited function. To fulfill the written description requirements set forth under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, the specification must describe at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, or alternatively describe a representative member of the claimed genus, which shares a particularly defining feature common to at least a substantial number of the members of the claimed genus, which would enable the skilled artisan to immediately recognize and distinguish its members from others, so as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant has possession the claimed invention. Applicants have not described the genus of claimed blebs such that the specification might reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that Applicants had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The specification states that "techniques for downregulating these genes are discussed in WO 01/09350) (incorporated by reference herein). " on page 5, first full paragraph. Essential material" may be incorporated by reference, but only by way of an incorporation by reference to a U.S. patent or U.S. patent application publication, which patent or patent application publication does not itself incorporate such essential material by reference. "Essential material" is material that is necessary to:

Art Unit: 1645

(1) Provide a written description of the claimed invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out the invention as required by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112;

(2) Describe the claimed invention in terms that particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention as required by the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112; or

(3) Describe the structure, material, or acts that correspond to a claimed means or step for performing a specified function as required by the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

The instant specification fails to teach how to downregulate any of the genes recited in the instant claims.

The purpose of the "written description" requirement is broader than to merely explain how to "make and use"; the applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, whatever is now claimed. See *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Federal Circuit, 1991). Furthermore, the written description provision of 35 USC § 112 is severable from its enablement provision; and adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. The nucleic acid itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. The Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1, "Written Description" Requirement (66 FR 1099-1111, January 5,2001) state, "[p]ossession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual

reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was 'ready for patenting' such as by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention" (Id. at 1104). Moreover, because the claims encompass a genus of variant species, an adequate written description of the claimed invention must include sufficient description of at least a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. However, factual evidence of an actual reduction to practice has not been disclosed by Applicant in the specification; nor has Applicant shown the invention was "ready for patenting" by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete; nor has Applicant described distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that Applicant were in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The Guidelines further state, "[f]or inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus" (Id. at 1106); accordingly, it follows that an adequate written description of a genus cannot be achieved in the absence of a disclosure of at least one species within the genus.

The scope of the claim includes numerous structural and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification does not describe any members of the claimed genus by

Art Unit: 1645

complete structure. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus, and thus, that the applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus. The claimed subject matter is not supported by an adequate written description because a representative number of species has not been described.

There are no drawings or structural formulas disclosed of any of these variants. Based on the lack of knowledge and predictability in the art, those of ordinary skill in the art would not conclude that the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus of blebs based on disclosure of the single species of a bleb with a deleted *lgtB* gene.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are set forth in *In re Wands* 8 USPQ2d 1400. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Applying the above test to the facts of record, it is determined that 1) no declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132 or other relevant evidence has been made of record establishing the amount of experimentation necessary, 2) insufficient direction or guidance is presented in the specification with respect blebs which have been downregulated for expression of various genes 3) the relative skill of those in the

Art Unit: 1645

art is commonly recognized as quite high (post-doctoral level). With regard to (4) the nature of the invention and (5) the state of the prior art, these have been discussed above. One of skill in the art would require guidance, in order to make or use the blebs in the methods and compositions as instantly claimed.

Response to Applicants' arguments re: the 112, first paragraph rejections(enablement and written description):

Applicants argue that the techniques for genetically engineering Neisserial strains are not essential material with respect to the claims. They argue that claims 1-8, 14 and 16-18 are not directed to techniques for genetically engineering Neisserial strains, but rather to isolated bleb preparations from Neisserial strains with particular genetic modifications. Concerning the written description rejection, they argue that the prior art taught the sequence of the lgtB gene from a number of different Neisserial strains. They argue that downregulation of expression of a gene product of a known sequence was well known in the prior art. Thus, they argue that combined with the knowledge of Neisserial lgtB gene sequences known in the art and the knowledge of one of skill in the art regarding methods of disrupting the expression of known genes demonstrates that the inventors were in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. These arguments have been fully and carefully considered but are not deemed persuasive. The instant claims are a product-by-process. In order to obtain the claimed bleb, one would have to have knowledge of the actual strain (with its specific gene mutations) in order to produce and claimed bleb. Without a complete description of the specific gene

Art Unit: 1645

modifications of the strain from which the bleb is obtained, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and/or use the claimed bleb.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 59 and 60 are allowed.
8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1645. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Remsen. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1645 Fax number is 571-273-8300 which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1645

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E. Graser whose telephone number is (571) 272-0858. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi, can be reached on (571) 272-0956.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0500.

/Jennifer E. Graser/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645

3/24/10